AUG 3 1 2006 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application

Inventors: Patrick Chiu, et al. Application No.: 09/843,197

Confirm. No.: 8826 Date Filed: April 26, 2001

Title: INTERNET-BASED SYSTEM FOR MULTIMEDIA MEETING MINUTES

PATENT APPLICATION

Art Unit: 2178

Examiner: Cong Lac T. Huynh Atty. Docket No.: FXPL-01024US0

Customer No. 23910

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Facsimile No. (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below.

_(Signature)

-Mathew Otts

3/31/06 Signature Date:

2[™] REQUEST FOR SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Madam/Sir:

This is a second request for a summary of the interview which took place between the Examiner and the Applicant on August 16, 2006, at 11:00 PCT. The Examiner and the Applicant discussed two (2) questions. The first question was whether a declaration of fact by an inventor made under 37 CFR 1.131 can be used to support more than a single argument for antedating a prior art reference. The second question was whether the Applicants' declaration as submitted would support the requirements for establishing conception and due diligence during the entire period.

"In order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application". MPEP 707.07(f). The Examiner is requested to fully explain, the ground for the rejection or otherwise to reconsider the ground for the rejection.

FLIESLER MEYER LLP

Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4156

Telephone: (415) 362-3800 Customer No.: 23910

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony G. Craig Registration No. 50,342